

**VIRGINIA ROANOKE RIVER BASIN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 23, 2003**  
**Ebony Fire House**

**Attendance:** All VRRBAC members except Senator Hawkins, Del. Byron, Delegate Hurt, Lee Eddy, Watt Foster, Evelyn Janney, Mike McEvoy, and John Primiano; Ann Austin represented Virgil Goode; DEQ: Greg Anderson; DCR: Tim Ott

**Call to Order:**

Chairman Feild called the meeting to order.

**Welcome/Recognition of Visitors:**

- Gerry Vincent, County Administrator, Brunswick County, welcomed all the members, visitors, and guests to Ebony and Brunswick County. He commented on the function of the advisory committee in assisting the Bi-State Commission in fulfilling its duties and carrying out its objectives. He expressed the importance of these objectives to South-side Virginia and the Roanoke River Basin. He spoke of the uses of the water from hydropower, drinking water, tourism, and recreation. He indicated that all of these uses constituted the economic backbone of the basin economy. He expressed an appreciation to the Committee for their dedication and hard work on river basin issues.
- Chairman Field recognized the visitors and guests including Jerry Lovelace, Halifax County, Skip Wiegiersma, Lake Gaston Weed Council, Jean McCarter, Lake Gaston Association, Bill Lindenmuth, Lake Gaston Association, Tom Leahy, Virginia Beach, and Hal Sharpe, Roanoke River Basin Association.

**June 26, 2003 meeting minutes:**

A motion was made to approve the minutes as written. The motion was seconded and passed.

**Tom Leahy, City of Virginia Beach; Presentation: "Operation of the Virginia Beach/Lake Gaston Pipeline and the Recent Re-licensing Settlement Agreement".**

- Project Components consist of the Pump station, intake structure, 76 miles (122 Km) of 60-inch pipeline, six river crossings, three pressure control structures, eight tunneled road/RR crossings, fifty-two other road crossings, and the terminus near Windsor, Isle of Wright County. The pipeline empties into Lake Prince. Most of the line is located in the Va. Power ROW or about 44 miles Railroad ROW purchased mostly from N&S. The line goes north initially so as to use the power Row and then proceeds east with the railroad ROW. The purpose of the pressure controls is to throttle the water. The Lake Gaston level is generally at 200 feet MSL and the water reaches the maximum height of 335 feet MSL near the basin ridge. It then flows by gravity and exits at about 50 feet MSL.
- The permit process began in 1982, with the last permit action taking place in 1995. The last judicial resolution was handed down in 1998. Besides the ROW's mentioned above other land was obtained from a mix other landholders. Many were done through condemnation with Va. Beach using the right of eminent domain. Only a few of these went to court and most of these involved estates. One 1987-88 case involving Champion Paper challenged the City's right to use the condemnation process outside its boundaries.
- The Pump Station is a 7,000 square foot facility and is licensed to withdraw a maximum of 60 MGD. It is a flooded wet well design and the bottom is 35 feet below normal pool level of lake. It uses 6 vertical turbine pumps. Five of these are dual speed pumps, which can pump at design specifications between 10 and 15 MGD. The other is a constant speed pump, which can pump between 4 and

**Tom Leahy, City of Virginia Beach; Presentation: “Operation of the Virginia Beach/Lake Gaston Pipeline and the Recent Re-licensing Settlement Agreement” (continued)**

8 MGD. The pumps are rated higher than the permitted withdrawal because of the “C” factor, an experimental coefficient dealing with friction losses, used in pipe flow applications that varies with roughness, velocity, and other circumstances. In addition the small constant speed pump can not run if more than one of the bigger pumps are running at low speed. The life expectancy on the pumps is 20 years and everything else 40 years (indefinite if maintained properly).

- The Intake structure consists of four Tee Screen Assemblies of the continuous slot wedge-wire type. The dimensions of each screen are 7 ft. Diameter by 14 ft. The screen slot opening width is 1.0 mm. The Max. Velocity through the slot is 0.5 ft. per second. It drops quickly to about 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of that velocity. Divers clean the screens about once per year. Zebra mussels are not a problem, as yet, apparently because the environmental factors of calcium levels, water temperature, and substrate to grow on may not be suitable.
- The facility has been designed to be aesthetically pleasing. Noise reduction was accomplished by using the flooded wet well design with submerged vertical turbine pumps. In addition the motors are the quietest available for size/type and the interior of the pump station was lined w/special sound reducing concrete block. Visually, the pump station has a low profile and resembles an up-scale house, with customary landscaping. The intake screens do not disturb water surface except when being back-washed. This occurs for about 30 seconds once per week.
- The final regulatory action, which cleared the way for the Gaston pipeline, was an **amendment** to Dominion Power’s FERC license to operate Lake Gaston. That 50-year license expired in 2001. The process to renew the license began shortly after FERC granted approval for the water withdrawal in 1995.
- In order to facilitate the FERC approval of the City’s pipeline project in 1995, VA Beach made a number of proffers to that agency. The proffers were taken from the failed settlement agreement with North Carolina. FERC declined to make the proffers binding but warned VA Beach to be **“true to its word.”** Since 1995, VA Beach has implemented the proffers as if they were traditional regulatory obligations.
- Dominion and all of the stakeholders in the re-licensing process have been working towards a settlement agreement for five years. This settlement agreement identifies license conditions and other agreements among the parties that satisfy most, if not all, of the stakeholders. If accepted by the FERC, a new license would issue consistent with the agreement, and litigation would (presumably) be avoided.
- A primary objective of NC and other key stakeholders has been to have the 1995 proffers included in the settlement agreement. For its part, VA Beach indicated that it would support this objective.
- The parties to the agreement include Dominion, North Carolina, Virginia, USFWS, NMFS, TNC, VA Beach, RPLG, RRBA, LGA and others.
- The agreement has 7 articles dealing with flow, 2 dealing with fisheries, 4 dealing with the lake (water levels, shoreline management, etc.) and 3 dealing with recreation and historic resources.
- Article FL6 addresses management of inter-basin transfers during critical droughts. Other articles impact other stakeholders during critical droughts. Dominion’s ability to generate hydropower will be reduced (peaking and base generation) and lake residents will see lower water elevations. Additionally, river rafting and canoeing will be impacted and minimum in-stream flows will be reduced.

**Leahy, City of Virginia Beach; Presentation: “Operation of the Virginia Beach/Lake Gaston Pipeline and the Recent Re-licensing Settlement Agreement” (continued)**

- Article FL6 – Drought Response initially applies only to SEVA Users (i.e., communities that get water from the pipeline). VA and NC agree that similar obligations are appropriate for future or expanded transfers. Drought restrictions on SEVA Users can be no more than what North Carolina imposes upon its new or expanded transfers from the Roanoke. Roanoke Rapids and Henderson will likely qualify at some point. Raleigh-Durham and/or Greensboro certainly will if or when such projects ever happen.
- Article FL6 – Drought Response defines a Critical Drought as - A drought in the Roanoke River Basin with a minimum return period of 20 years. This definition will be used as a trigger for minimum conditions when conservation measures may be imposed. The definition is consistent with what VA Beach proffered. As a practical matter only three droughts in the last century would be expected to trigger action (1930-31, 1980-81, 2001-02).
- NCDENR and VDEQ may jointly declare a critical drought. If they do, NCDENR may call for certain water conservation measures. If VDEQ does not agree, NCDENR may still impose conservation measures, but not stricter than what it imposes on NC water systems that use inter-basin transfers from the Roanoke. USACE may override NCDENR and VDEQ. The process for declaring end to the drought is similar. It's a reverse process.
- The Water Conservation Measures are as follows: 1.) All water supply sources within jurisdiction limits must be used to the maximum extent practicable. 2.) All alternative sources that can be obtained, consistent with good utility system practices and at a cost of not more than 20% of the price charged to wheel and treat Gaston water must be used. 3.) Any emergency/conjunctive use groundwater that is practically and economically available must be used. 4.) Implementation of conservation measures to reduce water demands (VA Beach Ordinance) is required.
- Article FL6 – Other Provisions are as follows: 1.) All other proffers VA Beach made to FERC. 2.) \$200,000 annual payment for Hydrilla control– ***Adjusted for Inflation.*** 3.) No export of Gaston water outside of SE VA. 4. No party may receive water from the Gaston pipeline until that party agrees in writing to be bound by Article FL6. 5. Gaston pipeline is limited to 60 MGD. 6.) Stipulates the use of storage for striped bass spawning. 7.) Maintain an active conservation program. 8.) A commitment to regional conservation. 9.) No interference with alternative water supplies. 10.) No interference with land/lake use activities.
- In conclusion, the obligations in the settlement agreement are substantially equivalent to what the City proffered, to its conduct since 1995, and to its response to the 2001-02 drought of record. It is the recommendation of the staff that the City Council authorize the City Manager to execute the multi-party FERC settlement agreement on behalf of VA Beach.
- **Question: One of the fears of RRBA is that lawyers for Raleigh, Cary, and Durham would just use the briefings from this situation as a play book for getting a pipeline from Kerr Reservoir. Has there been any contact with the attorneys for Virginia Beach from Raleigh or Durham concerning a pipeline from Kerr Reservoir?** He is not aware of any contact. He talked to a consultant several years ago.
- Virginia Beach is a partner in the operation of Kerr Reservoir in that it owns a portion of the storage in the conservation pool. This storage right was purchased in accordance with the Federal Flood Control Act. It is really a perpetual lease situation. This storage would be used in the event the Gaston withdrawal was causing Dominion to not be able to meet its downstream release requirements. At that time the water would be released to Gaston. Virginia Beach pays Dominion about \$200,000 on average and as much as 400,000 per year for lost generation of energy.

**Tom Leahy, City of Virginia Beach; Presentation: "Operation of the Virginia Beach/Lake Gaston Pipeline and the Recent Re-licensing Settlement Agreement" (continued)**

- **Comment: The purchase of storage in Kerr Reservoir does not a riparian partner make. For an entity to enjoy riparian rights it must be physically located in the river basin. Va. Beach enjoys those rights in the James Basin but not in the Roanoke Basin.** Tom responded that many States follow riparian law, and everyone one implements them a little differently. For instance some do not even recognize riparian law in lakes. In Virginia this question has never been resolved. There was a suit entitled the riparian rights lawsuit. I will be happy to send you the briefs from our side of the story but you will have to get the other side of the story from the other side. We are not the ones to debate the issue because it is a very complicated issue. Another problem is that the permit process with the State and Federal government do not mesh well with the riparian doctrine.
- Norfolk and Virginia Beach have a contract in which Norfolk agrees to store and provide seasonal peaking. For example, if Virginia Beach pumps in 30-MGD, Norfolk provides an average of 30-MGD to Va. Beach. Virginia Beach provides the water and Norfolk puts it in their system and supplies the City of Va. Beach. If you look at a 10-year average we get much more water than we pump from Lake Gaston. That's because we do not pump large amounts of water when the reservoir volumes are high.
- **Question: Is all the water leaving Gaston utilized? The reason for the question is that many believe it is all not used and would like it pumped back.** The answer is yes it is all used. The only time water goes over the spillway is during a major storm such as a hurricane. Water must be kept flowing in the line or it can go stagnant. This is never a problem in normal times. At the pumping rates available it takes from about 1-5 days for the water to reach Lake Prince. Normal operation is generally 2-3 days. Oxygen levels are monitored and there is a cascade as it goes into the lake to re-oxygenate the water. Norfolk treatment efficiency is at about 90 %, which is considered good. Many systems lose about 20 %.
- Virginia Beach pays 1 % of all operation and maintenance expenses associated with Kerr Dam.
- **Question: What are current groundwater levels?** Tom indicated that the coastal plain had recovered but could not speak for the remainder of the State.
- **Question: Has there been any study of reusing wastewater for a drinking water supply?** Not really a formal study but the idea was considered by the permitting agencies. Due to current aesthetic values Virginia Beach really does not have the type of users where water reuse would be attractive. Most of its customers are residential (81 %). VDH and EPA look for non-potable uses such as industrial or irrigation uses. An alternative is to put it back in the reservoir or groundwater aquifer and re-treat. The issue is complicated. HRSD is researching water reuse.
- Very little potable water is used for irrigation in Va. Beach. Most homes can utilize shallow wells if they choose to water the landscaping. Only those homes close to the ocean cannot. No golf course uses City water for this purpose. Many courses water only the greens and tees in drought times and let the fairways go brown.
- About a year or so ago there was a situation where Va. Beach was asked if they could provide water to Brunswick County for a Co-generation plant. The City would have to get a new permit because the current one is so restrictive. They could probably provide the water in this instance but likely the pipeline would have to be cleaned (pigged is the term used by utilities) to remove the scale in the line to provide the capacity needed at the terminus. Virginia Beach did not close the door on Brunswick County tapping into the line but the issue is not currently not being pursued. If a deal was ever made the County would have to agree to F16.

**Tom Leahy, City of Virginia Beach; Presentation: "Operation of the Virginia Beach/Lake Gaston Pipeline and the Recent Re-licensing Settlement Agreement" (continued)**

- There was a brief discussion about hydrilla in the Norfolk lakes. It is not a problem there because the levels fluctuate and during a drought much of the shoreline is exposed. This makes the environment not suitable for hydrilla. Part of the problem at Gaston is the fact that it is so stable.
- Virginia Beach has 57 gallons per day per capita consumption, which leads the nation. This is compared to 83 in the rest of the State. Attributed partly to good rainfall and the availability of shallow wells. This number continues to drop, possibly due to new efficient water using appliances.
- Virginia Beach spent \$13 million (\$3 million from the water utility and \$10 million from the general fund) to buy Stumpy Lake and the surrounding property from Norfolk. This was done to prevent the development and to prevent the draining of the lake. This demonstrates commitment to the agreement. Also, spending several hundred thousands of dollars repairing the water line and upwards of \$1 million or more to repair the dam.
- Virginia Beach's position regarding Lake development and Lake use is that they will never interfere in this arena. In reality the State and Federal government are doing plenty. At some point you may begin to see aesthetic effects at Pea Hill Creek due to failing drain fields, such as algae blooms, etc. This will occur long before there is an issue with potable water. Currently the development levels are not that big and basically just around the edge of the lake. In addition much of it is seasonal. This could change in the future if the development grows larger and becomes a yearlong community. The communities will look to Virginia Beach to step in and help pay for sewer system in the Pea Hill Creek area. In his opinion this is the area that is most at risk because there is no flushing effect. This problem will probably not happen in the main stem since there is plenty of flushing from Kerr. The impact will likely be upstream of the withdrawal. Fresh water actually comes in below the intake. In addition the pipeline actually transports nutrients out of the system, therefore actually removing the type of compounds that could contribute to the eutrophication of the lake.
- Tom displayed 3 graphs of data that demonstrated the severity of the recent drought. In the graphs the inflow to Kerr is never below 4000-CFS as compared to the 93-CFS maximum transmittal of the pipeline. This data was adjusted for the period of time prior to Kerr. The length of this drought was much longer than the previous severe droughts.
- A comparison of costs of Va. Beach providing drinking water from the Gaston Project and desalination were displayed. Total costs with Norfolk water plus desalination would be 44 % higher. Total desalination would be 104 % higher. Va. Beach is the largest city in Virginia, 430,000 capita, and has a large population at the poverty level. Such increases would impact these people tremendously as they just do not have the money. Their current rates are the second highest rate among the 50 largest cities in the nation.
- **Question: Given that the example used was for seawater, which is 6X saltier than brackish water, has Va. Beach looked at using brackish water?** Virginia Beach concluded the brackish water would have to come from Back Bay and the regulatory agencies would be less favorable of that withdrawal. There is also an issue with intake design related to the shallow depth of the bay.
- **Question: Who paid for the Lake Gaston project and how was it done?** Virginia Beach paid for the project with cash. The original plan was to issue bonds. However, rates had already been raised and by the time the project was approved cash was available.
- Tom is to provide to Greg Anderson some documents that he has collected over the years related to water law and water allocation. Greg will distribute to the members in some manner. Please note that individuals who may have differed with VA Beach on the issue of the Lake Gaston pipeline have

**Tom Leahy, City of Virginia Beach; Presentation: "Operation of the Virginia Beach/Lake Gaston Pipeline and the Recent Re-licensing Settlement Agreement" (continued)**

authored some of these documents. As such, Virginia Beach does not necessarily endorse anything that may be in these documents. There is a book published by AWWA entitled "Water Rights of the Eastern United States." It goes into great detail about Riparian Law and how it is interpreted differently in the 31 eastern states. Tom is to provide a copy of the table of contents for distribution. Finally, he is to transmit a little more detail to some of the questions concerning desalting and wastewater reuse that were asked. Greg will share this as well.

- A comment was made praising Virginia Beach for the support of the Lake Gaston community, specifically the money provided for Hydrilla control.
- Tom volunteered to return and talk to the group again on the issues of water reuse and desalination.

**Sub-committee Reports:**

- Agricultural and Forestry: Heywood Hamlet has been working to get the committee established. There is an interest in the next full Committee meeting to be held at VT Kentland Farms and to have the meeting focus on agriculture topics.
- River Interests: Watt Foster was not present. Read Charlton indicated he had a possible resource to speak to the sub group on legal issues. Also wanted to know if the group should have a presentation from the paper mill at Plymouth. Discussion ensued and it was believed that the company would more appropriately be a part of the NC advisory group.
- Municipal Interests and Permit Holders: John Priamiano was absent. Greg indicated that further information on contacts had been forwarded to the subgroup related to water intakes.
- Water Committee: Mike McEvoy was absent..
- Lakes Interest Committee: Robert Conner reported that the first Lake Meeting was tonight for Lake Gaston. There are two more meetings planned for Kerr Reservoir and Smith Mountain Lake. The former is to be on August 13<sup>th</sup> in Clarksville. The meeting will be at 7:00 p.m. at the Clarksville Community Center. The Smith Mt. Lake meeting has not been scheduled but Charles Poindexter is working on the arrangements. The purpose of the meetings is to solicit issues of concern from the various Lake communities. It is believed that for the most part the issues will be the same and consolidating the viewpoint will result in a more effective voice for action. The information gathered will be presented to the entire committee. Jean McCarter, Lake Gaston, has joined the subcommittee as an adjunct member.

**Other Business:**

- An issue was raised by Senator Ruff regarding the possible Granville County, NC purchase of the water intake/rights of the Burlington Plant in Clarksville. The plant is in bankruptcy proceedings. Evidently an offer has been made and this issue is currently in the hands of the court involved. This is the largest volume of water rights in Kerr Lake and could potentially change the entire dynamics of this section of the basin. According to Chairman Field, the Clarksville Industrial Development Authority considers this the number one priority for the future of Clarksville. However, the Town and Mecklenburg County do not have the resources to go this path alone. It would take Federal Grants and/or State participation. I am not sure of a vehicle to secure this but it is apparent that a team of Federal, State, and Local officials would need to work together to be in a position to secure these rights. This is an opportunity and it would be very detrimental to the area to lose this resource. Granville has reportedly had discussions with Raleigh, Cary, and Durham and engineering studies are

**Other Business: (continued)**

- underway for the use of water in those areas. A question was asked if the recent agreement with Va. Beach would prohibit the sale to NC. Tom Leahy indicated that his understanding is that any new or expanded inter-basin transfers in the basin would have to face the same restrictions or something functionally equivalent as Virginia Beach. If NC does not follow through with such requirements it essentially lets Va. Beach off the hook. However, it is very likely that Virginia Beach would follow through with its obligations anyway. He suggested that we get John Morris of the NCDENR Inter Basin Transfer Permit program to speak to the group. These permits are not easy to obtain. If the water was to be used in Granville County and returned to the basin we may not be having this discussion. There was a dialogue as to whether or not the Committee should pass a resolution concerning this issue. At an earlier meeting a resolution was passed that said that this Committee was against any inter-basin transfers that would have a substantial negative impact on the people of the basin. This group believes that it must protect our water resources and growth potential. Water resources are recognized as essential for the economic vitality of communities/stakeholders in the Roanoke River Basin. Chairman Field indicated that the subcommittees must prepare position papers on the issue and bring them back to the full Committee for adoption. He wants the sub-committees to bring the most knowledgeable people possible to the table, where the work of this Committee must take place. He wants broad-based input consolidated from as many interested parties as possible. A concern was expressed that the Water Policy TAC might allow others in Virginia to look at the Roanoke Basin for water. It was stated that in reality Va. Beach is now a partner in the basin and they are acting as a partner in the basin. They have as much interest as anyone in protecting the quality of water coming to their pipeline and thwarting any other possible impacts. A suggestion was made that the Committee develop a list of 10 priority rules or guidelines for the use of water in the Basin. Chairman Field indicated the subgroups should brainstorm the idea and bring recommendations to the full Committee. Perhaps at the next meeting a portion of the agenda can be set aside to refine this list. Senator Ruff indicated that the vision of the operation of VRRBAC was that the sub committees would be the eyes and ears of the full committee. The sub-committees should bring issues back to the full committee in a timely manner. These issues could then be addressed in a time frame suitable for effecting any required remedy.
- Greg Anderson discussed the planned VRRBAC web-site on the DEQ system. He passed a list of suggested content to the members and asked that these be considered for inclusion on the site. He further asked that members respond back to him any suggested changes or additions. A recommendation was made to include a link to flow data for the basin on the site.
- Greg Anderson reported that he had not received a response from the Secretary of Natural Resources office regarding the John H. Kerr 216 Sponsors Advisory Committee appointment. According to Jerry Loveless VRRBAC was not on the recent updated list of participants. He was asked to communicate again with the SN office. This appointment is a priority for the Committee.
- Greg Anderson handed out a copy of an article promoting the benefits of organic fertilizers in stabilizing soil and preventing erosion. Senator Hawkins sent this article to him and asked that it be given to the Committee for consideration. A constituent of Senator Hawkins had forwarded it to him.
- The issue of the effectiveness of Hydrilla treatment was raised. There is a concern that the treatments are not very effective because it does not appear to be any better. The lakes in the Roanoke River Basin of Virginia are a very important part of the basin economy and Hydrilla impacts uses of the water. Virginia should provide more money to help eradicate this invasive plant and determine treatment options. It is believed that some knowledgeable person was needed to confirm the effectiveness of the treatment. The lake sub-committee is to look hard at this issue. Senator Ruff spoke to VT and was referred to their expert, Elton Brown, who quickly informed him he got that title by default. He was really a noxious weed specialist. Not sure if we have an expert in Virginia. Charles Poindexter indicated that at SML they went to NC State. That lake is looking for AEP, citizens groups, and the counties to kick in some money until the issue is addressed on the State/Federal level. Currently Hydrilla has not been isolated at SML but other evasive species are

**Other Business: (continued)**

- present. The NC State specialist advised the group and allocated money was not spent. The depth and apparently temperatures involved are not conducive to proliferation at Smith Mt. Lake. It can grow at depths up to 26 feet. Delegate Wright reported that the General Assembly has created an Evasive Species Committee. He spoke to Secretary Murphy and informed him to be sure that Hydrilla was addressed and that any money available should go towards fighting it. He also spoke to Congressman Goode and made him aware of the situation. Congressman Goode indicated that it was a big problem and that it may be tough to get money for it. Chairman Field indicated that the USACE Waterways Experimental Station could possibly be of use. This group has an aquatic weed specialist who is knowledgeable about Hydrilla. Evidently just breaking off and floating to a new location can spread the weed. Perhaps the expertise of the USACE group can be shared with the sub committee. Congressman Goode could possibly help with these arrangements.
- Charles Poindexter asked that speakers be obtained for future agenda items; 1.) A report on the Water Policy Technical Advisory Committee 2.) An update on Wastewater Treatment Package Plant Technology. The former item concerns the Committee charged with developing State Water Policy as a result of Governor Warner's Water Policy initiative and SB 1221. A link to the website of the TAC is <http://www.deq.state.va.us/info/waterpolicy.html>. Greg had already communicated with DEQ staff working on this TAC about talking to the group. Since the meeting he has received a commitment from Scott Kudlas to make a presentation after the TAC's report is completed. This presentation can likely be arranged for either late November or early December. Delegate Wright indicated that the drought really brought this issue to the forefront. He believes it is going to be difficult to produce a comprehensive State water policy in such a short period of time. The latter item is of interest because there are sites speaking about putting in these plants that reportedly can produce an effluent of drinking water quality. Developers in the Smith Mt. Lake area are interested in this technology and believe they are close to getting permits to operate such a system. Since the meeting the situation has been researched. As it turns out, all discharges to SML and the Roanoke STP have been required to maintain an effluent phosphorus concentration of 0.2 mg/l. In the past these smaller package plants could not meet the lower phosphorus limits required. Evidently the scenario is now changing. Therefore, these plants that are apparently capable of meeting the lower limits may apply for a permit. They would have go through the standard permit process that would require public notice. At this time no permit application packages have been submitted to DEQ-WCRO for these plants in the SML drainage. It is my understanding that a pilot study is being conducted and the discharge is meeting the lower limits. Greg will work to make arrangements for a presentation on this topic.
- Charles Poindexter also mentioned that there were a couple vacancies on FERC and wondered if it might be beneficial for the basin to get a representative on that body. Charles has confirmed that this is a national level appointment, named by the President and confirmed by the US Senate. The Committee would need to work with our Congressmen and Senator in recommending a specific individual(s). Support of our state legislators would be needed as input to our federal representatives.

**Future Meetings:**

- A motion was made, seconded and passed that the next meeting will be held at Virginia Tech Kentland Farms near Blacksburg. The focus of the meeting will be agriculture issues and a tour of the farm operations including Best Management Practices (BMP's). The meeting will likely be scheduled in late September pending what arrangements can be made with the facility. Greg will poll for the date. Greg and Evelyn Janney will make the arrangements.

**Adjournment:**

- A motion was made, seconded and passed to adjourn the meeting.
- A tour of the Virginia Beach Lake Gaston Pumping Station followed.



